



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/903,124 | 07/11/2001 | Kevin O'Keefe | 6571-01 | 9529 |

7590 11/16/2004

McCormick, Paulding & Huber
City Place II
185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

ANANTHANARAYANAN, RAMYA

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2131

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/903,124

Applicant(s)

O'KEEFE, KEVIN

Examiner

Ramya Ananthanarayanan

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 14, and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2131

1. Claims 1-19 have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on July 11, 2001 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In paragraph 0006, line 12, there is a typo. The words "to the" are repeated twice. Another typo appears in paragraph 0020, line 8, in which the word "and" fails to appear between "first value" and "second values".
4. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 1 is objected to for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, lines 6-7 claim: "a computer network containing said electronic documents connected to said server via a second network interface". However, as is known in the art at the time of the invention, a computer network cannot contain electronic documents. Rather, a computer network may connect to devices on which the electronic documents are stored, and thus have access to such documents.

Art Unit: 2131

Thus, lines 6-7 of claim 1 will be interpreted for examination as "a computer network having access to said electronic documents connected to said server via a second network interface".

6. Claims 1, 3, 14, and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said user" in line 11. Additionally, claim 3 recites the limitation "the user" in line 3, and claim 14 recites the limitation "said user" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations.

8. There is a typographical error in claim 16, in which the limitation "in claim 14" should be "in claim 15". The claim will be treated as such by examiner.

9. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2131

11. Claims 1-6 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Erickson (U. S. Patent 6,807,534).

12. With respect to claim 1, Erickson discloses an apparatus for providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network comprising:

A server computer (column 10, lines 61-64);

A user interface connected to said server via a first network interface for providing user access to said server (column 19, lines 22-25);

A computer network accessing said electronic documents connected to said server via a second network interface (column 19, lines 17-19);

A database connected to said server via a third network interface, for storing data for authenticating said electronic documents (column 24, lines 9-11; column 5, line 67 to column 6 line 4);

Wherein said first network interface, said second network interface and said third network interface are disjunct respective to each other such that said user, said computer network and said database are not in communication therebetween (Figure 1);

A verification server comprising first and second network interfaces for connecting said computer network and said database thereto (column 15, line 7, 10-15, column 24, lines 15-45);

Wherein said first and second network interfaces are disjunct such that said database is not accessible to said computer network;

Wherein said apparatus provides a user access to authenticated

Art Unit: 2131

electronic documents from said computer network (column 3, lines 33-50).

13. With respect to claim 2, Erickson discloses an apparatus for providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network wherein said access is limited to selected documents (column 5, lines 43-45 state that the registration server in which documents are registered and then allowed to be accessed by users can vary in size and selection.).

14. With respect to claim 3, Erickson discloses an apparatus for providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network wherein said access is selective based on the user (column 5, lines 53-55 state that a user needs a license to view a document meaning that a user selects the documents he or she would like to access.).

15. With respect to claims 4 and 6, Erickson discloses an apparatus for providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network wherein said computer network is a public network, for example the Internet (column 3, lines 22-25 state that the documents may be transmitted over an online server and/or the Internet).

16. With respect to claim 5, Erickson discloses an apparatus for providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network wherein said computer network is a private network (column 3, lines 24-27).

17. With respect to claim 12, Erickson discloses an apparatus for providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network wherein said apparatus is scalable (column 5, lines 42-46).

18. With respect to claim 13, Erickson discloses an apparatus for providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network wherein said database is updatable (column 18, lines 10-11).

19. With respect to claim 14, Erickson discloses an apparatus for providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network wherein said user is a computer (column 19, lines 22-25).

20. Claims 15, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bates et al. (U. S. Patent 6,721,721).

21. With respect to claim 15, Bates et al. disclose a method for providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network comprising the steps of:

- a) Initializing a database by storing indexed information for identifying and authenticating each of said electronic documents therein (column 2, lines 23-30);
- b) Receiving a user request for an electronic document (column 2, lines 25-27; column 10, lines 40-50);

Art Unit: 2131

- c) Searching and retrieving from said database said information for identifying and authenticating said requested document (column 2, lines 23-30);
- d) Accessing said network and retrieving the content of said requested document (column 2, lines 24-26; column 6, lines 43-47);
- e) Calculating a checksum for the content of said retrieved document (column 12, lines 56-59);
- f) Comparing said checksum with said authenticating information for authenticating the content of said retrieved document (column 12, lines 56-59);
- g) Returning the content of said retrieved document to user if authenticated (column 2, lines 24-27);
- h) Returning a refusal to user if the content of said document not authenticated (column 14, lines 43-53); and
- i) Updating said authenticating information for said document in said database with the authenticity status thereof (column 13, lines 23-34).

22. With respect to claim 16, Bates et al. disclose

- a) Iteratively traversing said database and retrieving said indexed information for identifying and authenticating each of said electronic documents (column 7, lines 3-11);
- b) Retrieving from said network the content of said indexed electronic document (column 2, lines 24-26; column 6, lines 43-47);
- c) Calculating a checksum for the content of said retrieved document (column 12, lines 56-59);

Art Unit: 2131

- d) Comparing said checksum with said authenticating information for authenticating the content of said retrieved document (column 12, lines 56-59);
- e) Updating said database with the authenticity status of said document (column 13, lines 23-34).

23. With respect to claim 19, Bates et al. disclose that the user request is received from a computer (column 3, line 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. Claims 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson (U. S. Patent 6,807,534) in view of Loukianov (U. S. Patent 6,715,075).

26. Erickson discloses the limitations set forth in claim 1 upon which claims 7, 9, and 10 are dependent. However, Erickson does not disclose the limitations set forth in claims 7, 9 or 10. Loukianov discloses the limitations set forth in claims 7, 9, and 10.

Art Unit: 2131

27. Erickson and Loukianov are analogous art because both are in the field of data communication systems.

28. With respect to claim 7, Loukianov discloses a router connected to said user interface, said computer network, said server computer, and said verification server for forwarding data packets from said computer network to said server computer and said verification server (Figure 2; column 2, lines 35-39; By incorporating the router of Loukianov in the system of Erickson, the router, which already connects the computer (server), broadband network (to which the user is connected), and external network, would have to also connect the verification server because it is located in between the network and the server.).

29. With respect to claim 9, Loukianov discloses a router connected to said user interface and said server for transmitting data therebetween (Figure 2; column 2, lines 35-39; By incorporating the router of Loukianov in the system of Erickson, the router connects the computer (server), broadband network (to which the user is connected).).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Loukianov with the system of Erickson in order to provide faster routes to forward data and also serve as gateways for different types of networks.

Art Unit: 2131

31. With respect to claim 10, Loukianov discloses a database containing indexed information for identifying and authenticating each document, and also a status indicator for storing the status of the authenticity thereof (column 2, lines 48-54; Loukianov discusses the indexing of configuration information relating to modems but the indexing of configuration for electronic documents would be analogous. Loukianov also stores a baseline privacy configuration setting as well in column 2, line 64, which serves to indicate the privacy setting of the modem, and would be analogous to a status indicator for an electronic document.).

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Loukianov with the system of Erickson in order to provide easier access to identification and status of each document.

33. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson (U. S. Patent 6,807,534) and Loukianov (U. S. Patent 6,715,075) as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Bommareddy et al. (U. S. Patent 6,779,039).

34. The combination of Erickson and Loukianov disclose the limitations set forth in claims 1 and 7, upon which claim 8 is dependent. However, the combination of Erickson and Loukianov do not teach the limitations set forth in claim 8. Bommareddy et al. disclose the limitations set forth in claim 8.

Art Unit: 2131

35. Erickson, Loukianov, and Bommareddy et al. are analogous art because all are in the field of data communication systems.

36. With respect to claim 8, Bommareddy et al. disclose a high-speed switch (Figure 8, item 810; column 6, lines 14-16; column 14, lines 50-53) connected between said router (Figure 8, item 818) and said server computer, said database, and said verification server (Figure 8, items 812, 816) for providing data transmissions therebetween.

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bommareddy et al. with the combined system of Erickson and Loukianov in order to provide full and dedicated bandwidth to each component of the combined system.

38. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson (U. S. Patent 6,807,534) in view of Gruse et al. (U. S. Patent 6,398,245).

39. Erickson discloses the limitations set forth in claim 1 upon which claims 10 and 11 are dependent. However, Erickson does not disclose the limitations set forth in claims 10 or 11. Gruse et al. discloses the limitations set forth in claims 10 and 11.

Art Unit: 2131

40. Erickson and Gruse et al. are analogous art because both are in the field of data communication systems.

41. With respect to claim 10, Gruse et al. disclose a database containing indexed information for identifying (column 12, lines 64-66) and authenticating (column 13, lines 10-12) each document, and also a status indicator for storing the status of the authenticity thereof (column 23, 27-42: The copy/play status corresponds to the authenticity status of the electronic documents.).

42. With respect to claim 11, Gruse et al. disclose a process of retrieving all the records from a database, checking the authenticity of the record and updating the status indicator accordingly (column 62, lines 55-60).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gruse et al. with the system of Erickson in order to provide an accuracy checking mechanism for the records stored in the database.

44. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (U. S. Patent 6,807,534) in view of Rust et al. (U. S. Patent 6,098,190) and Howell et al. (U. S. Patent 5,226,091).

Art Unit: 2131

45. Bates et al. disclose the limitations set forth in claim 15 upon which claim 17 is dependent. However, Bates et al. do not disclose the limitations set forth in claim 17. The combination of Rust et al. and Howell et al. disclose the limitations set forth in claim 17.

46. The combination of Rust et al. and Howell et al. disclose a method of providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network wherein the step of calculating a checksum for the content of said retrieved document further comprising the steps of:

- a) Retrieving indexed seed numbers for said document from said database (Rust et al: column 2, line 66-67; column 1, lines 57-60);
- b) Traversing a forward pass of the data stream of the content of said retrieved document and calculating a first value for each position in said data stream using said seed numbers (Howell et al.: Abstract; column 13, lines 19-21);
- c) Traversing a reverse pass of the data stream of the content of said retrieved document and calculating a second value for each position in said data stream using said seed numbers (Howell et al.: Abstract; column 13, lines 19-21); and
- d) Summing said first value and said second value (Howell et al.: column 13, lines 41-43, and lines 46-54).

47. Bates et al., Rust et al. and Howell et al. are analogous art because all are in the field of data communication systems.

Art Unit: 2131

48. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Rust et al. with the system of Bates et al., and further incorporate the method of Howell et al. into the modified system of Bates et al. and Rust et al. in order to make a more robust checksum and enhance the authentication of the documents in the database.

49. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (U. S. Patent 6,807,534) in view of Rust et al. (U. S. Patent 6,098,190), Nelson et al. (U. S. Patent 6,526,092) and Ippolito et al. (U. S. Patent 4,509,851).

50. Bates et al. disclose the limitations set forth in claim 15 upon which claim 18 is dependent. However, Bates et al. do not disclose the limitations set forth in claim 18. The combination of Rust et al., Nelson et al., and Ippolito et al. disclose the limitations set forth in claim 18.

51. The combination of Rust et al., Nelson et al., and Ippolito et al. disclose a method of providing access to authenticated electronic documents over a network as defined in claim 15 wherein the step of calculating a checksum for the content of said retrieved document further comprising the steps of:

a) Retrieving indexed seed numbers for said document from said database (Rust et al: column 2, line 66-67; column 1, lines 57-60);

Art Unit: 2131

b) Initializing values for said checksum and a length counter equal to the length of the content of said retrieved document (Nelson et al.: column 14, lines 49-50);
c) Initializing a start counter to zero (Ippolito et al.: column 10, lines 34-44); and
d) Traversing the content of said document character by character, adding to said checksum a first calculated value and a second calculated value for each character thereof wherein said start counter is incremented and said length counter is decremented for each said character traversed (Nelson et al.: column 14, lines 51-56; Ippolito et al.: column 10, lines 34-44).

52. Bates et al., Rust et al., Nelson et al., and Ippolito et al. are analogous art because all are in the field of data communication systems.

53. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Rust et al. with the system of Bates et al., and further incorporate the methods of Nelson et al. and Ippolito et al. into the modified system of Bates et al. and Rust et al. in order to make a more robust checksum and enhance the authentication of the documents in the database.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramya Ananthanarayanan whose telephone number is (571) 272-5860. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 -5.

Art Unit: 2131

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RA


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100